

Serial No.: 10/782,519

Filing Date: 2/18/2004

Attorney Docket No. H0006282-5435

Title: SYSTEMS AND METHOD FOR ENCODING AND DECODING DATA MESSAGES

---

**REMARKS**

The Final Office Action mailed on January 2, 2009 has been reviewed. Claims 1-39 are pending in this application.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, and 38 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell (EP Publication No. 0981088) in view of Schwartz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,437,408). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

**Claim 1 recites:**

A method comprising:

- a. receiving a message formatted according to Abstract Syntax Notation One (ASN.1); and
- b. decoding the received message based on a previously stored configuration information file (CIF), wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.

In addressing the limitation “wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file,” the Examiner relied on Schwartz in asserting that “the MAG module is a table driven and performs transformations on input data using a table structure.” FOA pg. 3. However, the MAG module is not a CIF as described in the present application and claimed in claim 1. In particular, the present specification states “The CIF ***defines uplink message definition*** based on the ASN.1 schema. The CIF is tree-based and table driven to ***define message syntax***. The CIF also ***defines what actions are to be taken*** or can be taken with the message (e.g. display including format, print including format, responses, pilot actions, etc.)” paragraph [0031] emphasis added.

However, the MAG module in Schwartz is only discussed in the context of “using the format specification to parse the message ***into its various fields*** and reading the information from the various fields.” Col. 16, lines 61-63 emphasis added. Nothing in Schwartz discusses a CIF which “defines what actions are to be taken or can be taken with the message.”

Furthermore, ASN.1 notation does not use pre-defined structured fields like those discussed in Schwartz where the type of data is dependent on the order (as shown in Fig. 9 of Schwartz). For example, in ASN.1 notation, the message itself can define the type of variable and length of the variable as well as the value. *See* John Larmouth, *ASN.1 Complete*, pages 29-30 (Open Systems Solutions 1999) available at <<http://www.oss.com/asn1/larmouth.html>>. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Tidwell based on Schwartz since the function of the MAG module in Schwartz is directed towards transforming data formats having pre-defined structured fields whereas ASN.1 does not use pre-defined structured fields where the type of data is dependent on the order.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 1 is not obvious over Tidwell in view of Schwartz. Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8 depend from claim 1 and, thus, are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8 be withdrawn. Since, the Applicant believes these dependant claims are allowable for at least the above reasons, further response to all rejections have not been put forth in this response. The Applicant, however, retains the right to address said rejections if a further response is filed.

In rejecting independent claims 10, 19, 30, and 35, the Examiner referred to arguments similar to those made with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicants' arguments described above with respect to claim 1 are applicable to claims 10, 19, 30, and 35. Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, and 17 depend from claim 10. Claims 20, 21, 23-25 and 27 depend from claim 19. Claims 31 and 33 depend from claim 30 and claims 36 and 38 depend from claim 35. Consequently, claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 23-25, 27, 31, 33, 36, and 38 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to the respective independent claims 10, 19, 30, and 35. Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 10-12, 14, 15, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, and 38 be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 18, 28, 34 and 39 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell (EP Publication No. 0981088) in view of Schwartz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,437,408) and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0181787). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 9, 18, 28, 34, and 39 depend from claims 1, 10, 19, 30, and 35, respectively. Nothing in Applicant's Admitted Prior Art cures the defects of Schwartz and Tidwell discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 9, 18, 28, 34, and 39 are not obvious over Tidwell in view of Schwartz further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 9, 18, 28, 34, and 39 be withdrawn.

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell (EP Publication No. 0981088) in view of Schwartz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,437,408) and further in view of Allison et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,900). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 29 depends from claim 19 and inherits the limitations of claim 19. Nothing in Allison cures the defects of Schwartz and Tidwell discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, claim 29 is not obvious over Tidwell in view of Schwartz further in view of Allison. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 29 be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 16, 26, 32, and 37 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell (EP Publication No. 0981088) in view of Schwartz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,437,408). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 7, 16, 26, 32, and 37 depend from claims 1, 10, 19, 30, and 35, respectively, and thus inherit the limitations of claims 1, 10, 19, 30, and 35. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 7, 16, 26, 32, and 37 are not obvious over

Serial No.: 10/782,519

Filing Date: 2/18/2004

Attorney Docket No. H0006282-5435

Title: SYSTEMS AND METHOD FOR ENCODING AND DECODING DATA MESSAGES

---

Tidwell in view of Schwartz. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 7, 16, 26, 32, 37 be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that claims **1-39** are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 2, 2009

/David N. Fogg/

David N.Fogg  
Reg. No. 35138

Attorneys for Applicant  
Fogg & Powers LLC  
5810 W. 78<sup>th</sup> Street, Ste. 100  
Minneapolis, MN 55439  
T – (952) 465-0770  
F – (952) 465-0771